DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 254 825 CS 007 946

TITLE Success in Reading and Writing, School Year 1982-83. Final Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION District of Columbia Public Schools, Washington, D.C. Dept. of Research and Evaluation.
PUB DATE Aug 83
NOTE 109p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Education; Evaluation Methods; Integrated Activities; *Program Content; *Program Evaluation; *Reading Achievement; *Reading Attitudes; Reading Instruction; Reading Materials; *Reading Programs; Teacher Attitudes; *Writing Instruction
IDENTIFIERS *Success in Reading and Writing Program

ABSTRACT

The Success in Reading and Writing Program (Success) developed by Anne Adams incorporates ideas from many approaches to reading instruction. It uses newspapers, magazines, library books, content area textbooks, catalogs, and other reading materials; it requires an instructional period that is divided into four or five units of one-half hour each; and it involves both whole class and individualized instruction. The Washington, D. C., Public Schools system has been using the program since 1978-79 in both elementary and junior high school classrooms. The program was evaluated to determine its effectiveness in improving reading performance, reading attitudes, and writing performance; as well as to discover teacher and administrator attitudes toward the program and whether it had an impact on student promotion. The evaluation revealed that (1) the third grade Success program group had significantly higher reading achievement than a comparison group; (2) third and fourth grade students in the program acquired a more positive attitude toward reading during the period from the pretest to the posttest; (3) second grade students in the program wrote significantly better than students in a comparison group; (4) prekindergarten, kindergarten, and elementary school teachers were satisfied with the program; (5) junior high school teachers were somewhat satisfied, but also had several concerns; (6) principals were satisfied with the program; and (7) the program had a positive impact on student promotion. (Materials used in the evaluation are appended.) (FL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED254825

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS

in Reading and Writing

School Year 1982-83

Final Evaluation Report

Floretta Dukes McKenzie
Superintendent of Schools
Chief State School Officer

August 1983

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Cooper

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS 007 946

District of Columbia Public Schools

OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT

Floretta Dukes McKenzie	Superintendent of Schools
Andrew E. Jenkins, III	Deputy Superintendent

OFFICE OF INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES

James T. Guines	Associate Superintendent
Mary L. Harris	Director, Success Program

DIVISION OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
(QUALITY ASSURANCE)

Mildred P. Cooper	Assistant Superintendent
June Bland	Assistant for Evaluation
Leslie Smart	Research Assistant, Chapter II Evaluation
Sheila Reid	Secretary

CONSULTANT

Eva Chunn, Ph.D.	Program Evaluator

District of Columbia Public Schools

Success in Reading and Writing

School Year 1982-83

Final Evaluation Report

September 1983

Floretta Dukes McKenzie
Superintendent of Schools

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	v
SUMMARY	viii
INTRODUCTION	1
Success In Reading And Writing	1
General Objectives of The Success Program	4
Junior High Program	5
1978 - 1979 Pilot Project	6
1979 - 1980 Pilot Project	6
1980 - 1981 Success Program	7
1981 - 1982 Success Program	7
1982 - 1983 Success Program	9
PURPOSE OF STUDY	10
EVALUATION DESIGN	12
Objectives Of The Evaluation	12
Instrumentation	13
Methodology	15
Objective 1	16
Objective 2	19
Objective 3	20
Objective 4	21
Objective 5	22
Objective 6	22
Limitations	22
RESULTS	23
Objective 1	23
Summary	24
Objective 2	25
Summary	26
Objective 3	26
Summary	27
Objective 4	27
Pre-k-K Summary	31
Elementary Summary	40
Jr. High Summary	46
Objective 5	47
Summary	50
Objective 6	51
Summary	51

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

	Page
RECOMMENDATIONS	53
APPENDICES	
A. SAMPLE - SUCCESS IN READING AND WRITING PROGRAM LESSON PLANS	54
Grade Pre-K-Kindergarten	55
Grade 1	56
Grade 2	57
Grade 3	58
Grade 4	59
Grade 5	60
Grade 6	61
Junior High Weekly Schedule	62
Junior High	63
B. SUCCESS IN READING AND WRITING PROGRAM EVALUATION DESIGN	64
C. ESTES ATTITUDE SCALE	69
D. HOLISTIC SCORING	71
E. PRE-KINDERGARTEN-KINDERGARTEN QUESTIONNAIRES	73
F. ELEMENTARY TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRES	77
G. JUNIOR HIGH TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRES	81
H. PRINCIPAL QUESTIONNAIRES	84
I. PERCENTILE TO NORMAL CURVE EQUIVALENT CONVERSION TABLE	87

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		Page
1.	REGIONS AND SCHOOLS BY NUMBER OF CLASSES PARTICIPATING IN THE READING SAMPLE USED FOR THE CTBS	17
2.	LEVEL OF IMPLEMENTATION FOR GRADES 1,2 AND 3	19
3.	ACHIEVEMENT IN READING OF THE THIRD GRADE SUCCESS AND COMPARISON GROUPS	23
4.	COMPARISON OF READING ACHIEVEMENT OF HIGH LEVEL OF IMPLEMENTATION CLASSES AND MEDIUM LEVEL OF IMPLEMENTATION SUCCESS CLASSES	24
5.	MEANS AND t-VALUES FOR ESTES ATTITUDE SCALE	25
6.	MEANS AND t-VALUES FOR SUCCESS AND COMPARISON GROUPS WRITING EXERCISE	26
7.	TEACHERS' MEAN RATING OF THEIR PERCEPTION OF STUDENTS ENJOYMENT OF THE SUCCESS MODULE AND THEIR OWN ENJOYMENT	29
8.	ADVANTAGES OF THE SUCCESS PROGRAM AS INDICATED BY PRE-KINDERGARTEN AND KINDERGARTEN TEACHERS	29
9.	DISADVANTAGES OF THE SUCCESS PROGRAM AS INDICATED BY PRE-KINDERGARTEN AND KINDERGARTEN TEACHERS	30
10.	PRE-K-K SUCCESS TEACHERS' ASSESSMENT OF THE MOST DIFFICULT MODULES	30
11.	NUMBERS AND MEANS BASED ON ELEMENTARY TEACHER RATINGS OF THE DEGREE THE SUCCESS PROGRAM HAS IMPROVED THE READING PERFORMANCE OF THEIR STUDENTS	31
12.	NUMBER OF DAYS, PER WEEK, BY GRADE, THE SUCCESS PROGRAM WAS INSTRUCTED	32
13.	NUMBER AND PERCENT OF TEACHER, BY GRADE TEACHING ALL SUCCESS MODULES DURING THEIR INSTRUCTIONAL PERIOD	33

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

TABLE		Page
14.	NUMBER AND PERCENT OF TEACHERS, BY GRADES ABLE TO EMPLOY THE SUCCESS PROGRAM IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE STUDENT PROGRESS PLAN (SPP)	33
15.	LAST SUCCESS LESSONS TAUGHT BY END OF MAY, BY GRADE	34
16.	NUMBER AND PERCENT OF SUCCESS TEACHERS USING THE PROGRAM EXCLUSIVELY BY GRADES	34
17.	SUCCESS MODULES DIFFICULT TO TEACH BY GRADE	35
18.	NUMBER AND PERCENT OF SUCCESS TEACHERS PLANNING TO USE PROGRAM SY 1983-1984, BY GRADE	36
19.	ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF SUCCESS PROGRAM FOR GRADES 1-6	36
20.	TYPE OF JUNIOR HIGH STUDENT HELPED MOST BY THE SUCCESS METHOD	41
21.	NUMBER AND PERCENT OF JUNIOR HIGH TEACHERS EMPLOYING SUCCESS METHOD WEEKLY	42
22.	NUMBER AND PERCENT OF JUNIOR HIGH TEACHERS EMPLOYING ALL SUCCESS KEY ELEMENTS DAILY	42
23.	JUNIOR HIGH TEACHERS' PERCEPTION AS TO THE DEGREE THE SUCCESS PROGRAM HAS IMPROVED THE READING PERFORMANCE OF THEIR STUDENTS	43
24.	ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF THE SUCCESS PROGRAM AS REPORTED BY SUCCESS JUNIOR HIGH TEACHERS	44
25.	PRINCIPALS' MEAN RATINGS AS TO HOW THE SUCCESS PROGRAM IMPROVED TEACHING ABILITIES	47

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

TABLE		Page
26.	PRINCIPALS' MEAN RATINGS FOR READING AND WRITING ATTAINMENT OF SUCCESS STUDENTS IN COMPARISON TO STUDENTS IN OTHER READING PROGRAMS	48
27.	PRINCIPALS' ASSESSMENT OF THE USE OF THE STUDENT PROGRESS PLAN (SPP) IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE SUCCESS PROGRAM	48
28.	A SUMMARY OF PRINCIPALS' ASSESSMENT OF ADVANTAGES OF THE SUCCESS PROGRAM	49
29.	PROMOTION/RETENTION DATA SECOND SEMESTER SY 1982-1983 FOR SUCCESS CLASSES: GRADES 1-6	52

SUMMARY

The Success in Reading and Writing Program (Success) was brought to the attention of the District of Columbia Schools by the School Services Branch of the Washington Post newspaper. The late Dr. Anne Adams, the originator and the primary developer, developed the program to incorporate the best from many approaches to the teaching of reading. Materials for instruction consisted of the following: newspapers, magazines, library books, science, social studies and music textbooks, catalogues, etc. The instructional period is divided into four to five units of one-half hour each and incorporated whole class teaching and individualized instruction. The second semester of the school year 1978-79 marked the beginning of the Success Program in D.C. Public Schools.

The 1982-83 project encompassed 45 elementary schools and 103 classrooms (comprised of 7 special classes and pre-kindergarten through sixth grade). In the junior high Success Program there were 23 junior high schools comprised of 36 junior high classes.

This evaluation focuses on pre-kindergarten through sixth grades and on junior high teachers.

The objectives of this evaluation were as follows:

(1) To measure the effectiveness of the Success Program in improving the reading performance of students in the program as measured by the Comprehensive Test Of Basic Skills.

(2) To measure the effectiveness of the Success approach in improving the reading attitude of students in the program as measured by the Estes Attitude Scale.

(3) To measure the effectiveness of the Success approach in improving the writing performances of the students.

(4) To determine teachers' satisfaction with the Success program by administering teacher questionnaires at the end of the school year 1982-1983.

(5) To determine principals' satisfaction with the Success program by administering principal questionnaires at the end of the school year 1982-1983.

(6) To determine if the Success program has had an impact on students' promotions.

The results included in this evaluation were as follows:

(1) The statistical analysis done for this objective indicated that the third grade Success group had significantly greater reading achievement than the Comparison group. The second analysis performed related that high implementation third grade Success students and medium implementation Success students did not differ significantly in their reading achievements.

(2) Statistical analysis comparing third and fourth grade Success students pretest, posttest Estes Reading Attitude means indicated that a more positive attitude

toward reading had been acquired during the period between the pretest and posttest by Success students.

(3) Statistical analysis performed comparing the writing of second grade Success students and second grade Comparison students related that the Success group wrote significantly better than the Comparison groups.

(4) Pre-kindergarten - Kindergarten (Pre-K-K) teachers appear satisfied with the Success Program due to the following: (1) They cite many advantages of the program; (2) the program is enjoyed by students and teachers; (3) one-hundred percent of the teachers agree that Pre-K-K students are learning to associate words with tangible and intangible concepts in pictures more rapidly with the Success Program than with a traditional program; (4) eleven of the twelve teachers of the sample related that their children can read words printed in a variety of materials; (5) Only the Oral Language Modules were seen as difficult to teach.

Grades 1-6 teachers of this sample appeared satisfied with the Success Program due to the following: (1) The Success Program had improved the reading performance of the students; (2) a high percentage of grade 1-5 teachers taught all

Success modules each day; (3) teachers of grades 1,2, 3,4 and 6 had no problem using the Student Progress Plan in conjunction with the Success Program; (4) grades 1-5 had a high percentage of Success teachers using the program exclusively; (5) one hundred percent of the sample of classes in grades 2,3,4 and 6 will use the program next year; Only grade 5 had a low rate (two of four) fifth grade teachers of this sample of teachers unwilling to use the program next year; (6) many advantages of the program are cited by teachers of all grades.

Junior high teachers of this sample have reported some satisfacation with the program and several concerns. Satisfaction is shown by the following: (1) Success modules and key elements are considered of junior high level; (2) the program helped most, the below grade level, unmotivated, disinterested students in grades 7,8 and 9; (3) they report the reading program has moderately improved the reading performance of their students; (4) ten of the eleven teachers in this sample will use the Success program again next year.

The following concerns have been identified as a result of analyzing teacher questionnaire data: (1) The Success program was used exclusively by only six of the twelve Success Pre-K-K teachers.

(2) the number of lessons taught within grades 1-6 varied greatly by the end of May; (3) seventy-three percent of the junior high teachers of this sample were not able to teach all modules as scheduled weekly; (4) only forty-six percent of the junior high teachers were able to incorporate all of the Success key elements required for a given day; (5) fifty-five percent of the junior high sample reported that there is not enough time scheduled or allotted by the Success manual to teach the modules; (6) many junior high teachers indicated there were insufficient materials.

(5) Principals of this sample indicated satisfaction with the Success Program. Satisfaction is evidenced by the following: (1) Fifteen of the eighteen principals reported that the teachers had no problem using the Success Program in conjunction with the Student Progress Plan; (2) principals of the sample are interested in using the program again next year; (3) they indicate that the reading and writing attainment of Success students in comparison to children in other reading program were greater; (4) the Success program has improved teaching abilities; (5) many advantages of the Success program are listed;

(6) It must be noted that ten of the eighteen principals or fifty-five stated that other reading programs are being used in conjunction with the Success Program.

(6) The Success Program has had a positive impact on student promotions as reflected in the following: (1) Success classes had a higher percentage of promotions than systemwide classes for grades 1-4; (2) a larger percentage of systemwide students for grades 1,2 and 4 were assigned to transition classes for reading deficiencies than Success students; (3) Success students had lower retention percentages in first and second grades than system students.

Recommendations to improve the program are as follows: (1) Junior high teachers need more workshops and demonstrations in order to facilitate the instruction of their program; (2) the time periods for the teaching of the junior high modules needs to be altered; (3) principals must be urged not to schedule special subjects during the period the Success program is taught; (4) the level of implementation of the Success Program needs to be continuously stressed to Success teachers. The program should be taught at least four days per week; all modules in a given lesson should be taught.

INTRODUCTION

The Success in Reading and Writing Program (Success) was introduced as a pilot project into the District of Columbia Public Schools under the umbrella of the Right-to-Read effort at the beginning of the second semester of School Year (SY) 1978-79. The program was brought to the attention of responsible public school officials through the School Services Branch of the Washington Post. A trip was then arranged for key public school officials to Durham, North Carolina Schools where the program was being used. Impressed with their observations they recommended that the program be tried as a pilot project in the District of Columbia Public Schools.

Success in Reading and Writing Program

The late Dr. Anne H. Adams, a professor of education at Duke University in Durham, North Carolina, developed the Success in Reading and Writing Program. Dr. Adams began to formulate the idea for the program during her tenure as a first grade teacher in 1964. She was interested in alleviating problems often associated with the instruction of beginning reading. The key elements of the Success Program are an outgrowth of her analysis of these problems.

Later, Dr. Adams researched, during her preparation for her doctoral dissertation, the concept of correlated language arts in the first grade without the use of basal readers. The Success in Reading and Writing Program evolved out of her studies. She concluded that anything in print (within reason) should be part of the basal reading program. Materials of instruction for students to learn to read included the following: newspaper; fiction and

non-fiction library books; content area textbooks; magazines, and similar materials. There is a close link in the acquisition of reading and writing skills. Reading vocabulary evolves out of the students' experiences. The classroom decor is compiled of charts with their vocabulary of words, word clusters, and sentences.

The Success Program calls for changes in materials of instruction and it also provides for changes in classroom procedure. Whole class teaching is preferred over grouping practices. This resulted from Dr. Adams' belief that certain grouping practices damages the teacher's effectiveness and students' self-concept.

Within this program individualized instruction which is a key element is defined as time (minutes or a few seconds) between the teacher and an individual student which focuses on what the student is doing, has done, or should be doing academically. Contact between teacher and student should occur from 3 to 4 times during the course of a lesson and is considered important to the affective development of the students.

The skeletal structure for each daily lesson is provided in the Success manuals. To implement the lessons adequately the teacher exercises her expertise and knowledge. Examples of a one day program for grades Kindergarten, 1,2,3,4,5, 6, and junior high are found in Appendix A. Dr. Adams incorporated within the Success Program, the best ideas of the past in the teaching of reading and writing.

In the Success Program, the reading period is divided into four to five modules of one-half hour each. Thus, the Success Program is implemented 2 to 2 1/2 hours out of the 5 hour teaching day.

The modules taught by grades are:

	Grade					
	Kgn.	2	3	4	5	6
Alphabet	x					
Oral Language	x					
Picture Word Association	x					
Story Time	x					
Phonics/Spelling	x	x		x	x	x
Language Experience	x	x				
Academic, Cultural Art and Current Events	x	x				
Patterning	x					
Decoding in Context			x			
Composition, Fluency/Accuracy			x			
Composition				x		
Composition Writing					x	x
Research Practices			x			
Study Skills				x	x	x
Recreational Reading	x	x	x	x	x	x

The environment in each participating classroom should reflect "key elements" of the program. Some of the "key elements" expected in any observation would be the following:

(1) Adherence to posted schedule;

(2) whole class teaching during preliminary discussion period, (approx. 10 minutes);

(3) contact with each child during writing phase of modules (individualized instruction);

(4) continuous display of charts;

(5) display of charts with students' vocabularies (words, word clusters, sentences);

(6) use of varied printed materials (newspaper, magazines, library books, textbooks, charts, etc.);

(7) development of independently written materials (factual and creative)

(8) fostering independence (proofreading and scoring);

(9) promoting accountability (daily filing of papers).

General Objectives of the Success Program

The three main objectives of the Success Program are reading and writing skills in the cognitive area and the development of a positive self-concept in the affective area. The Success manuals for grades Kindergarten though 6 delineates specific achievements in the aforementioned areas.

By the end of the school year each student should have experienced the following:

Reading Opportunities	Grades 1	2	3	4	5	6
o 300/350 library books	300	300	350	350	350	350
o daily newspapers	x	x	x	x	x	x
o current magazines	x	x	x	x	x	x
o textbooks (science, social studies, mathematics and music) primary level/upper-grade	x (primary only)	x	x	x (primary and upper grade)	x	x
o pamphlets, catalogues, etc.	x	x	x	x	x	x

	Grades					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Writing Opportunities						
o daily creative writing	x	x	x	x	x	x
o daily factual writing related to academic content information	x	x	x	x	x	x
o a variety of writing skills emphases		x	x	x	x	x
o words, phrases, paragraphs, and stories containing vocabulary from students in the class	x	x	x	x	x	x
o immediate closure and long-term writings		x	x	x	x	x
o daily proofreading checks		x	x	x	x	x
Affective Opportunities						
o Success in Academic Pursuits	x	x	x	x	x	x
o Positive and protective attitude toward school, teacher, classmates	x	x	x	x	x	x
o A Positive Self-Concept toward past and future learning experiences	x	x	x	x	x	x

Junior High Program

On February 11, 1981 the pilot Success Program began in sixteen junior high schools. A forty-five minute class period is utilized for the instructional period. Whole-class and individualized instruction are used. There are six modules organized around a weekly pattern in grades 7 thru 9 (See Appendix A).

These modules are labeled the following: (1) Functional Reading; (2) Consumer Vocabulary Development; (4) Reading and Writing Research; (5) Focused Reading and Discussion; (6) Reading Fiction and Non-Fiction Books. Newsweek magazine, The Washington Post newspaper, news magazines, daily newspapers, and the Reading For Survival In Today's Society workbooks are used within the program.

1978-79 Pilot Project

The Success in Reading and Writing Program was piloted in the second semester (Jan. 29-June 14, 1979) in 6 schools of Region V in the District of Columbia Public Schools. There were 18 classes with an approximate enrollment of 450 students. The eighteen classes were located in 6 different schools. Each school had a first, second and third grade class.

The evaluation of the Success in Reading and Writing Pilot Project during school year 1978-79 disclosed interesting aspects of its implementation and provided baseline data for a more comprehensive evaluation. The 1978-79 evaluation made many recommendations to improve the program.

1979-1980 Pilot Project

The Success Program was expanded during the SY 1979-80 to encompass six regions of the D.C. Public Schools. There were 66 teachers in 21 schools teaching kindergarten through fourth grade as of September 1979. Principals and teachers from participating schools received training from Dr. Adams.

The evaluation of the Success program for SY 1979-80 disclosed the following:

(1) The reading achievement gains of the Success group (on the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills) were significantly higher than that of the comparison group;

(2) The teachers were satisfied with the program due to varied reasons;

(3) Although the comparison group wrote better than the Success group in the writing exercise, the results were to be reviewed cautiously. The evaluator was not in charge of administering or collecting the samples from the two groups. It appeared as if the comparison sample did more "selecting out" of low quality papers than the Success sample.

(4) There was a significant difference between the pretest and posttest means of third grade Success students on the Estes Attitude Scale which was administered to measure reading attitudes. These results indicated that the Success group had developed a more positive attitude toward reading over the school year.

1980-81 Success Program

There were 32 elementary schools and 83 classrooms in the Success program. The Success program was expanded to junior high classes in February 1981. There were 15 junior highs located within the 4 regions. There were 30 classroom teachers in the junior high Success program. Training was provided for elementary teachers August 25-27 and September 25-26, 1980, and February 10-11, 1981. In March 1981 training was provided for junior high school teachers. On May 29, 1981 there was a closing evaluation meeting for junior high and elementary teachers.

No formal evaluation was prepared for 1980-1981 school year.

1981-82 Success Program

The 1981-82 project encompassed 39 elementary schools. There were 88 classrooms comprised of kindergarten through fourth grades.

In the junior high Success Program there were 23 junior high schools. There were 41 junior high classes. The Success Program also had 4 special teachers. The project director having worked with the program intermittently since its inception, came on board on a full time basis as of February 1982.

The principal and teachers from participating schools received training from Helen Cappleman (Dr. Adams' successor) on October 28, 29 and 30 in 1981. Both elementary and junior high teachers received training at this time. On May 27, 1982 there was an evaluation meeting for elementary teachers which was conducted by the project director.

The evaluation of the Success Program for SY 1981-82 disclosed the following selected results:

(1) First and second grade Success and Comparison groups did not differ significantly in their reading performances as measured by the California Achievement Test (CAT). The third grade Success groups had a significantly greater reading achievement gain than the comparison group on the CAT.

(2) Teachers appeared satisfied with many aspects of the Success Program but there were some problems, also.

(3) Principals of the sample indicated satisfaction with the Success Program.

(4) The Success groups (composed of third and fourth grade classes) had a significantly higher positive attitude toward reading than the Comparison group (composed of third and fourth grade classes). The groups were measured by the Estes Attitude Scale.

(5) Recommendations were made to improve the program.

1982-83 Success Program

The Success Program is currently used in elementary and junior high schools. Twenty-three junior high schools with a total of thirty-six teachers participated in the Success Program. There were forty-five elementary schools using the Success Program for the school year 1982-83. Seventy-four elementary teachers taught the Success Program on a full time basis. Twenty-two teachers used the Success Program partially. Seven special teachers participated in the program . A total of 103 Success elementary classes comprised the 1982-83 project.

For the first time the Success Program had a director for the entire school year. Staff development activities arranged by the director for the SY 1982-83 were the following:

(1) Dr. Helen Cappleman (Dr. Anne Adam's associate and consultant for the Success Program) on August 26th and 27th trained new teachers in the utilization of the Success method.

(2) A class was held once per month, during the period 9/82-6/83, by the Success director to train old and new teachers in the procedures for the utilization of the Success modules. Forty-two teachers participated in the class.

(3) Teaching demonstrations were set up for the week 11/15-11/19. Pre-kindergarten and kindergarten were demonstrated on 11/15, grade 1 on 11/16, grade 2 on 11/17, grade 3 on 11/18, and grade 4 on 11/19.

(4) During the period March 2-4, Dr. Cappleman demonstrated the teaching of a second grade class (on March 2) and a fourth grade class (on March 3) by using two classes in the District of Columbia Public Schools. The Success director and Dr. Cappleman also had a staff development meeting for junior high school teachers (on March 2).

On March 4th Dr. Cappleman discussed the main points of the Success program with elementary and junior high school principals of the District of Columbia Public Schools.

(5) On May 25, Success teachers, of grades kindergarten through 6, had an end of the year evaluation meeting led by the Success director.

(6) On June 27, new kindergarten through second grade teachers were trained by Dr. Helen Cappleman with outstanding teachers in the Success program used as facilitators. Training for 3rd-6th grade teachers was held on June 28 with the same format as previously stated.

Purpose of Study

The impact of the Success program on the reading and writing performances of the students for the school year (SY)1982-83 was desired by the Washington Post (the primary funder of the Success Program) and the District of Columbia Public Schools.

The level of implementation of the Success program by each Success teacher was a concern as indicated in the February 1980 1/, September 1980 2/ and November 1982 3/ evaluation reports.

1/ Success in Reading and Writing Pilot Project, Second Semester, School Year 1978-79: Final Evaluation Report. D.C. Public Schools, Division of Research and Evaluation: February 1980.

2/ Success in Reading and Writing Pilot Project: Final Evaluation Report. D.C. Public Schools, Division of Research and Evaluation: September 1980.

3/ Success in Reading and Writing Pilot Project: Final Evaluation Report. D.C. Public Schools, Division of Research and Evaluation: November 1982.

The Success director was interested in teacher and principal satisfaction, plus the reading attitudes of the students.

Promotion and retention data for the Success Classes had also been requested by the Associate Superintendent for Instruction in the District of Columbia Public Schools.

Therefore, it was decided that the evaluation study of the 1982-83 Success program would encompass the following:

(1) Students' reading performances based on the level of implementation by the teachers at the elementary level

(2) Students' writing performances

(3) Students' reading attitudes

(4) Teacher satisfaction with the Success Program

(5) Principal satisfaction with the Success Program

(6) Impact of the Success Program on students' promotion/retention rate.

Evaluation Design

Objectives of the Evaluation

The evaluation objectives as developed for the Success Program in January 1983 were as follows:

(1) To measure the effectiveness of the Success Program in improving the reading performances of students in the program as measured by the California Achievement Test (CAT).

(2) To measure the effectiveness of the Success approach in improving the reading attitudes of students in the program as measured by the Estes Attitude Scale.

(3) To measure the effectiveness of the Success approach in improving the writing performances of the students.

(4) To determime teachers' satisfaction with the Success Program by administering teacher questionnaires at the end of the school year 1982-83.

(5) To determine principals' satisfaction with the Success Program by administering principal questionnaires at the end of the school year 1982-83.

(6) To determine if the Success Program has had an impact on students' promotions.

The original evaluation design was modified in June 1983 to some extent in response to unanticipated circumstances (Appendix B). Those modifications are explained in the description of the instrumentation and methodology.

Instrumentation

The 1975 edition of the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (CTBS) (and not the (CAT) was used for testing of the third grade Success and Comparison groups. It is a norm-referenced achievement test published by the McGraw-Hill Company. Level 1, Form T of CTBS/T was the specific instrument used. Test items for the CTBS were written by teachers of the appropriate grades in cooperation with curriculum specialist, test specialists and CTBS/McGraw-Hill (the publisher). McGraw-Hill has conducted research in an attempt to identify and eliminate racial and ethnic bias in its product.

An instrument was not utilized to measure the Success program's effectiveness in improving the writing performance of its students. A procedure was used and is described in the methodology section.

Students attitudes were measured by the Estes Attitude Scale (Estes), an instrument developed by Thomas H. Estes. It was recommended by the National Right-to-Read Office to assess changes in the attitude of students toward reading (See Appendix C). The Estes has a reliability coefficient of .92 (split-half method) for grades 3-6.4/

4/ Right To Read Assessment and Planning Handbook. US Department of Health Education and Welfare: Office of Education, 1974. Pages 49-55.

Teacher satisfaction was determined by three questionnaires, one for pre-kindergarten and kindergarten, one for grades 1-6, and another for junior high teachers. The junior high and pre-kindergarten and kindergarten instruments were developed by the evaluator for this evaluation. The instrument for grades 1-6 was an instrument revised by the evaluator for the 1982 evaluation. It was revised again by the evaluator for 1983. The questionnaires included both closed and open-ended response items (See Appendices E,F and G).

The pre-kindergarten and kindergarten instrument was designed to elicit the following information concerning the Success Program: as a source of enjoyment for both students and teachers, the effectiveness of the program in improving listening, speaking abilities and the reading of words by pre-kindegarten and kindergarten students, plus the advantages and disadvantages of the pre-kindergarten and kindergarten Success Program.

The questionnaires for teachers of grade 1-6 was developed to provide the following information: to determine the effectiveness of the program in improving the reading performance of students; to ascertain the implementation of the program; to determine the effectiveness of incorporating the Success Program with the Student Progress Plan and the advantages and disadvantages of the program.

A junior high school questionnaire was developed to indicate the Success Program's impact on the student's reading performance, the type of student helped most by using the Success method, teachers' concerns in relation to implementing the Success Program, and the advantages and disadvantages of the Success Program.

Principal satisfaction was determined by a questionnaire that was revised for the 1982 evaluation, by the evaluator. The questionnaire was revised again for the 1983 evaluation. The information elicited from the principals' questionnaire was to ascertain the effectiveness of the program in improving the reading and writing abilities of the students', to assess principals' perceptions of improvement in teaching abilities of participating teachers; the impact of the Success Program on SPP, and advantages and disadvantages of the program.

To determine the Success Program's impact on students' promotions' and retentions data was obtained from the Division of Automated Information Service.

Methodology

The 1982-83 Success Program included selected classrooms, grades Pre-K through 6, for a total of 103 classrooms in 45 schools. There were also 36 junior high classes in 23 schools.

The sample used in this study to measure reading achievement consisted of 13 third grade Success classrooms, and 12 third grade comparison classes. The teacher questionnaires were administered to teachers attending an end of the year workshop on May 25, 1983. All non-attending teachers except special teachers were mailed questionnaires. Principal questionnaires were mailed to all elementary principals (45 principals). The Estes Attitude Scale was sent to all third and fourth grade classes (18 third grades and 17 fourth grades). A creative writing assignment for students in grades 1-6 was rated by a reading teacher and the Success Director. Data to determine the impact of the Success program on promotion and retention in the elementary schools was provided by the Division of Automated Information Services. The procedure for

determining the effectiveness of the program varied with each evaluation question and is described below by objective.

Objective 1. The CTBS was administered citywide to third and sixth grade students and to second grade Chapter 1 students in May 1983. The sample used in the analysis of achievement data included those classes for which data were available. The Success sample consisted of 13 third grade classes, the comparison sample (chosen from the same schools) consisted of 12 third grades (See Table 1). First, second, and 6th grade classes were not used in this study due to the following reasons:

1. First grade classes of the District of Columbia Public Schools were stratified into five different groups. Each group was administered a different test for a total of five in order to find the most valid test for this population. These tests have not been equated. It was decided not to use first graders because the internal validity of the study would be compromised;
2. All second grades in Chapter 1 schools were to be included in the study. In the 1982-83 school year, however, tests were administered only to second grade students receiving Chapter 1 assistance in reading and mathematics. It was decided that these second graders would not be a representative sample for inclusion in this study.
3. Sixth grade students were tested on the CTBS, however, the four sixth grade classes involved were partially implementing the Success Program.

Table 1

Regions and Schools by Number of Classes
Participating in the Reading
Sample Used for the CTBS

Region	School	Grade 3		Total Classes
		Success	Comparison	
A	Congress Heights	1	1	2
	Garrison	1	1	2
	Leckie	1	1	2
	Wilkinson	1	1	2
B	Clark	1	1	2
	LaSalle	1	1	2
	Powell	1	1	2
	Shepherd	1	1	2
	Takoma	1	1	2
	West	1	1	2
C	Cleveland	1	1	2
	Gage Eckington	*2	1	3
	Total	13	12	25

* One class was used in the first statistical analysis. Both were used in the second statistical analysis.

The scores used in the analyses were Normal Curve Equivalents. Normal Curve Equivalents (NCE's) are conversions of percentile score into an equal interval scale which has the same mean (50) and approximately the same range as the percentile scale. Being an equal interval scale, NCE scores can be divided, multiplied, added and subtracted, whereas, percentile and grade equivalent scores should not be. For the convenience of the reader a percentile NCE conversion table is included in Appendix J.

There was no fall pretesting, therefore, posttest scores only will be employed. The analysis consisted of a t-test at the .05 level of significance to compare the reading achievement means of the Success and comparision groups.

The level of implementation for grades 1,2,and 3 in Chapter 1 schools was considered in the analyses (See Table 2). The evaluator and the director of the program, during the period January 17, 1983 through May 27, 1983 observed primarily classes in Chapter 1 schools. Based on observation, reading scores for third grade Success classes were placed in high and medium groups and a second t-test at the .05 level was performed.

Table 2

Level of Implementation for Grades 1, 2 and 3.

Level of Implementation	# of Classes Grade 1	# of Classes *Grade 2	# of Classes *Grade 3	Total
High	2	2	6	10
Medium	8	5	2	15
Low	5	___	___	5
	15	7	*8	30

* Three teachers were not included in the observation total because they were not implementing the program during the observation period. Observations were confined to teachers in Chapter 1 schools.

Objective 2: The Estes Attitude Scale was administered in November 1982 and April 1983 to all third and fourth grade Success classes in participating schools. The combined total comprised thirty-five classes. Data was returned from 26 Success classes for a total of 518 students.

The Estes Attitude Scale a "likert" type instrument had four response options for each of the 20 items of the scale: strongly agree, undecided, disagree, and strongly disagree. The rating scale allowed from 5 points for a positive answer to 1 point for a negative answer. Thus, the highest possible score would be 100 and the lowest score 20. A score of 60 was considered neutral, scores below 60 were considered negative and scores above 60 were positive.

A pretest-posttest design was utilized to analyze the data. A t-test at the .05 level was performed to compare the pretest means and posttest means of the Success group.

Objective 3: Principals of the 45 Success elementary schools were requested to have all Success classes in their schools participate in a "writing" exercise "to be conducted on the morning of April 27". A comparison class for each Success class was to participate in the writing exercise, also. All students were given the same topic, "If Every School Closed Tomorrow" only the student's name was to appear on the paper, not the school or teacher's name. The papers of the students were to be placed in an envelope with the teacher's name on front and returned in the pre-addressed envelopes which were provided.

Of the 45 schools requested to participate, 14 schools responded for a total of 54 Success classes (out of a possible total of 96) and 14 comparison classes. Only second grade papers were rated. This was the only grade with a sufficient number of comparison classes.

Papers were received from 6 Success classes out of a possible total of 16. Six comparison classes submitted papers. The total number of papers received were 122 and 123 respectively.

The rating procedure used was the holistic approach described in Direct Measures of Writing Skill: Issues and Application.[4/] A brief description of the approach is included in this report in Appendix D. Two reading teachers were to serve as raters. Only one was able to participate, therefore, the Success Program director served as the second rater.

4/ Spandel, Vicki and Stiggins, Richard J. Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory: Clearinghouse for Applied Performance Testing. Portland, Oregon. January 1980.

Before beginning the rating process, the raters were briefed on the process by the program evaluator. They were given an opportunity to practice on sample materials provided and then to discuss their ratings. The raters used a 4 point scale with a "1" equal to the lowest rating and "4" the highest. The program evaluator randomly selected papers to give the raters. Thus, the raters did not know which papers were from Success or comparison classes.

The papers were scored individually by the raters and compiled by the program evaluator.

Three of the 245 papers scored were eliminated from the analysis. One paper was eliminated from the Success sample and one from the comparison sample, due to lack of agreement on the scores by the raters. The raters agreed on all other scores. One paper was eliminated from the Success sample because it contained only the creative writing title. The remaining sample consisted of 120 Success papers and 122 comparison papers.

Objective 4: Teacher questionnaires were administered to elementary teachers on May 25, 1983 at an end of year Success meeting. All non-present, teachers, except for special teachers, were mailed questionnaires. Sixty-seven questionnaires out of a possible total of ninety-six were returned. This represented a 67% response rate. Descriptive statistics - frequencies, percent, and means where appropriate - were used to report these results.

Eleven junior high questionnaires were received out of a possible total of 36. This response rate represented 31% of the junior high population.

Objective 5: Principal questionnaires were mailed to all elementary Success school principals in May, 1983. Out of the total of 45 principals, principal questionnaires were received from 18 principals. This represented a 40% return of the questionnaires. Descriptive statistics are used to report the results.

Objective 6: The program evaluator secured a computer printout from the Division of Automated Information Services (DAIS) of the Success Program's promotion/retention data. The data received from DAIS was for Success classes the second semester, of the 1982-1983 school year. Systemwide Data was received from the Division of Quality Assurance (Research and Evaluation). The data is analyzed for grades 1-4 utilizing descriptive statistics (frequencies and percents).

Limitations

(1) There was a response rate of 31% for the junior high questionnaires.

(2) There was a 40% response rate of elementary principals on the principal questionnaires.

(3) There was a 38% response rate by Success second grades on the writing exercise.

Results

Objective 1. To measure the effectiveness of the Success Program in improving the reading performances of students in the program as measured by the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (CTBS).

A t-test was performed to compare the reading achievement gains on the CTBS from pretest to posttest for the Success and comparison groups. The .05 level of significance was established as the criterion for measuring effectiveness. Table 3 displays the analysis.

Table 3

Achievement in Reading of the Third Grade
Success and Comparison Groups

Group	No. of Cases	Mean	S.D.	t-Value	Level of Sig.
Success	255	58.15	20.01	7.08	0.001*
Comparison	225	46.56	15.79		

* Statistically Significant Difference.

The t-value at less than the .001 level of significance indicated that there was a statistically significant difference between the Success and comparison groups. The Success groups had the higher mean (58.15). This indicated that the reading Achievement of the Success group was significantly higher than the comparison group.

A second t-test was performed to check the level of implementation of the program. Reading scores for third grade Success classes were placed into high and medium implementation levels to compare reading achievement gains. Table 4 displays this data.

Table 4

Comparison of Reading Achievement of High Level of Implementation Success Classes and Medium Level of Implementation Success Classes

Group	No. of Cases	Mean	S.D.	t-Value	Level of Sig.
High Success	135	53.85	19.41	-0.57	not significant
Medium Success	58	55.24	55.24		

The t-value of -0.57 indicated that there was no significant difference between the mean reading achievement on the CTBS of high implementation third grade Success student and medium implementation third grade Success student. In other words, both groups had the same reading achievement.

Summary: The analyses done for this objective indicated that there was a statistically significant difference between the third grade Success and comparison groups. The third grade Success group had significantly greater reading achievement than the comparison group. The second analysis performed indicated that there were no significant differences in reading achievement between high implementation third grade Success students and medium implementation third grade Success students. That is, both groups had the same reading achievement.

Objective 2: To measure the effectiveness of the Success approach in improving the reading attitudes of the student as measured by the Estes Attitude Scale.

A maximum score of 100 is attainable on the Estes Attitude Scale (Estes). A score of 60 is considered neutral on this scale. Scores below 60 are negative and scores above 60 are positive.

The Estes Attitude Scale was administered to 518 Success third and fourth graders in November 1982 and again in April 1983. A pretest-posttest design was employed.

A t-test was performed to compare the Success Estes pre-test mean with the Success Estes posttest mean. The criterion of effectiveness established was the .05 level of significance. See Table 5.

Table 5

Means and t-Values For Estes Attitude Scale

Group	No. of Cases	Mean	S.D.	t-Value	Level of Sig.
Pretest	518	77.30	11.09	-3.52	0.01*
Posttest	518	83.68	40.70		

*Statistically significant difference.

The t-value of -3.52 indicated that there was a statistically significant difference at the .01 level of significance between the Success pretest mean on the Estes and the Success posttest mean on the Estes. The posttest mean of 83.68 was higher than the pretest mean of 77.30. Thus, the Success students had become more positive toward reading during the period between the pretest and the posttest.

Summary: There was a statistically significant difference between Success students' pretest and posttest reading attitude means. The posttest reading attitude mean was higher. Therefore, a more positive attitude toward reading had been acquired during the period between the pretest and the posttest by third and fourth grade Success students.

Objective 3: To measure the effectiveness of the Success approach in improving the writing performance of Success students.

Ratings on a paper written in a writing exercise as described previously was the basis for data for this objective. One-hundred and twenty grade 2 Success students and 122 grade 2 non-participants in the Success Program made up the the comparison groups.

A t-test was performed to compare the means of the Success group and the comparison group. The .05 level of significance was established as the criterion for effectiveness. See Table 6.

Table 6

Means and t-Values For Success and Comparison Groups' Writing Exercise

Group	No. of Cases	Mean	S.D.	t-Value	Level of Sig.
Success	120	2.07	0.91	3.17	0.01*
Comparison	122	1.73	0.07		

*Statistically significant difference.

The t-value of 3.17 indicated that there was a statistically significant difference at the .01 level of significance between the Success and comparison groups. The Success groups' mean of 2.07 was higher than the comparison groups' mean of 1.73 which indicated that the Success group wrote better.

Summary: There was a statistically significant difference between grade 2 Success and comparison groups on the writing exercise. The Success groups' mean was higher than that of the comparison group indicating that the Success group wrote better.

Objective 4: To measure teacher satisfaction with the Success Program by administering teacher questionnaires at the end of school year 1982-1983.

In May, 1983 questionnaires were administered to Success teachers at a final Success meeting. All teachers who were not present (except special teachers) were mailed questionnaires. Responses were returned by 67% of the Success teachers. Twelve questionnaires were received from PreK-K teachers, 12 from first grade teachers, 10 from second grade teachers, 16 from third grade teachers, 9 from fourth grade teachers, 4 from fifth grade teachers and one from a sixth grade teacher for a total of 64 questionnaires out of a possible 96. Eleven junior high questionnaires were received out of a possible 36 for a response rate of 31%.

Pre-Kindergarten-Kindergarten (Pre-K-K)

All Pre-K teachers of this sample have reported that students participating in the Success Program are quite proud of their academic accomplishments. One-hundred percent of the teachers agree that prekindergarten and kindergarten children are learning to associate words with

tangible items and intangible concepts in pictures more rapidly with the Success program than with a traditional program. Eleven of the twelve Pre-K-K teachers related that their children can read words printed in a variety of materials.

Fifty percent of the Pre-K-K teachers used the Success Program exclusively. The following reasons were given by those Success teachers who were not using the program exclusively for their classes:

(1) Pre-Kindergarten students needed other materials and activities to reinforce skills;

(2) Different ages and ability levels made it necessary to use other methods so that each child could participate;

(3) Story Time had to be used in a different manner due to the attention span of young students. Stories were used that pertained to the topics being taught at a given time;

(4) One or two modules were used each day but a variety of resources are better to reach children of varying learning styles;

(5) The Joplin plan was in use thus, the students were not available for consistent work;

(6) A computer assisted reading program (Writing To Read) had to be meshed with the Success Program. The programs complimented each other.

Table 7 gives the mean ratings the teachers themselves Pre-K perceived as the level of enjoyment experienced by their students and by them. Both students and teachers enjoyed the Success modules.

Table 7

Teachers' *Mean Ratings of Their Perception of Students Enjoyment of the Success Modules and Their Own Enjoyment

	Picture Word Association	Alphabet Module	Oral Language Reading Module	Story Time Module
*Student Mean	6.7	6.6	5.7	6.3
*Teacher Mean	6.6	6.7	5.3 ,	6.3

*Means based upon rating by teacher using a 1-7 point scale with "1" indicating "unenjoyable" and "7" indicating "highly enjoyable".

Table 8 and 9 presents the advantages and disadvantages of the Success Program as cited by Pre-K teachers.

Table 8

Advantages of the Success Program As Indicated By Prekindergarten and Kindergarten Teachers

Number of Teachers	Advantages
2	a. Children learned to associate words with tangible items and intangible concepts in pictures.
6	b. The children were able to write their names, words, and short sentences whereas before children did not accomplish these skills in preschool.
3	c. The alphabet was taught without drilling and much quicker than usual.
2	d. They discussed story conclusions and characters much better.
	e. While involved in reading and writing, the children learned to interact with other children.
	f. A good self image was reinforced because of accomplishments.
	g. Their listening and speaking abilities improved.

Table 9

Disadvantages of the Success Program as Indicated by Pre-Kindergarten and Kindergarten Teachers

Number of Teachers	Disadvantages
2	a. With a half-day program it is difficult to teach each module and cover other curriculum areas.
2	b. It is difficult to find some of the pictures listed under the picture word module plus some are not pertinent to our area of study.
	c. Pre-Kindergarten children need more of a variety of activities and more reinforcement.
	d. It would be helpful to have an aide or some type of help. The program requires quite a bit of individualization.

Pre-K-K teachers have cited many advantages which infers that the program has been successful.

Table 10 reports the teachers' assessments of the most difficult module: the Oral Language module.

Table 10

Pre-K-K Success Teachers' Assessments of The Most Difficult Modules

Number of Teachers	Success Modules	Reasons for Difficulty
4	Oral Language	a. The module is time consuming which make it difficult to reach each child. Each child is very disappointed if he/she does not get a turn.
1	Oral Language	b. Oral language is not difficult to teach but it is difficult to get the students to think before answering a question and also to speak in complete sentences before answering questions.

Summary: Pre-K-K teachers appear satisfied with the Success Program due to the following reasons: (1) They cite many advantages of the program; (2) The Program is enjoyed by students and teachers; (3) one hundred percent of the teachers agree that PreK-K students are learning to associate words with tangible and intangible concepts in pictures more rapidly with the Success Program than with a traditional program; (4) eleven of the 12 teachers of the sample related that their children can read words printed in a variety of materials; (5) only the Oral Language Module was seen as difficult to teach.

There is one concern: the Success Program was used exclusively by only fifty percent of the Success Pre-K-K teachers. The reasons given related to some teachers' beliefs that a variety of instructional approaches were needed to accomodate students' learning styles.

Grades 1-6

Table 11 presents mean teacher ratings by grade for the degree the teacher felt that the Success Program had improved the reading performances of their students. The 1st and 3rd grade teachers rated their children as most improved, followed by 2nd and 4th grade teachers. Grade 6 is not included because only one 6th grade teacher responded.

Table 11

Numbers and Means* Based on Elementary Teacher Ratings of the Degree the Success Program Has Improved the Reading Performance of Their Students

Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3		Grade 4		Grade 5	
#	Mean	#	Mean	#	Mean	#	Mean	#	Mean
12	6.2	10	5.9	16	6.4	9	5.9	4	4.0

* Means based upon rating by teacher using a 1-7 point scale with "1" indicating "Little Improvement" and "7" indicating "Great Improvement".

Table 12 displays the number of days per week, by grade in which the Success program was taught.

Table 12

Number of Days, Per Week, By Grade
The Success Program Was Instructed

Grades	1		2		3		4		5	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Days										
1									1	25.0
2										
3	1	8.5	1	10.0	1	6.25	3	33.0	3	75.0
4	1	8.5	2	20.0	1	6.25	1	11.5		
5	10	83.0	7	70.0	12	75	4	44.0		
No Response					2	12.5	1	11.5		
Total	12	100%	10	100%	16	100%	9	100%	4	100%

First grade had the highest percentages (83%) of teacher teaching the program five days per week. The third grade and the second grade were next respectively with a high percentage (75% and 70%) of teachers teaching the Success program five days per week. Fifth and sixth grade teachers taught the Success program the fewest days per week. Grade 6 is not included because only one 6th grade teacher responded.

The teachers of grades 1-6 reported that the Success Programs were not taught some days due to the following: conflict with special subjects' schedule; reinforcement of SPP skills; principal required the use of basal readers; and the administration of tests and the completion of records.

Table 13

Number and Percent of Teachers, By Grade, Teaching
All Success Modules During Their Instructional Period

Grades	Yes, All Modules Taught		No, All Modules Not Taught		Total	Total
	#	%	#	%	%	#
1	9	75.0	3	25.0	100.0	12
2	8	80.0	2	20.0	100.0	10
3	15	94.0	1	6.0	100.0	16
4	7	78.0	2	22.0	100.0	9
5	3	75.0	1	25.0	100.0	4

Table 13 displays the number of teachers by grade, teaching all Success modules during their instructional period. Third grade teachers had the highest percentage of teachers (94%) using all four modules. Second grade was next (80%) followed by first grade (75%).

Table 14

Number and Percent of Teachers, By Grades, Able To Employ
the Success Program In Conjunction With
The Student Progress Plan (SPP)

Grades	Yes, Had Problem Incorporating SPP With Success		No Response		No, I Didn't Have Problem Incorporating SPP With Success		Total	Total
	#	%	#	%	#	%	%	#
1	2	17.0	0	0.0	10	83.0	100.0	12
2	1	10.0	0	0.0	9	90.0	100.0	10
3	1	3.5	1	3.5	14	93.0	100.0	16
4	0	0.0	1	11.0	8	89.0	100.0	9
5	3	75.0	0	0.0	1	25.0	100.0	4
6	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	100.0	1

Table 14 reports the number and percent of teachers by grades who were able to employ the Success Program in conjunction with SPP. More fifth grade teachers had a problem than teachers in other grades.

Table 15

Last Success Lessons Taught
By End of May, By Grade

Grade	Lesson # Reported	# of Teachers Reporting	No Response	Total # Teachers
1	78-140	10	1	12
2	73-150	10	0	10
3	25-156	14	2	16
4	48-120	8	1	9
5	22-91	4	0	4

Table 15 illustrates why it is important to check the level of implementation of the program. Teachers with the same grade are many lessons apart.

Table 16

Number and Percent of Success Teachers Using
The Program Exclusively By Grade

Grade	Yes, Using Only Success		No, Not Using Success Only		Total	Total
	#	%	#	%	#	%
1	9	75.0	3	25.0	12	100.0
2	8	80.0	2	20.0	10	100.0
3	15	94.0	1	6.0	16	100.0
4	7	78.0	2	22.0	9	100.0
5	3	75.0	1	25.0	4	100.0

Table 16 indicates that third and second grade had the highest percentage of teachers using the program exclusively. The percentage or teachers using the program exclusively in grades 1, 4 and 5 was not low.

Table 17

Success Modules Most Difficult
To Teach By Grade

Success Module	Grade	Number of Teachers	Total Number of Teachers In Sample
Academic, Cultural Arts, Current Events Reading,(ACC)	1	2	12
Academic, Cultural Arts, Current Events Reading,(ACC)	2	6	10
Patterning	1	2	12
Recreational Reading	1	2	12
Language Experience	1	1	12
Research Practicum	3	5	16
Composition/Fluency Accuracy	3	1	12
Study Skills	4	2	9
Study Skills	5	1	4

Table T-11 illustrates the fact that the ACC module was the most difficult for second grade teachers to instruct. Grade 3 teachers had the most problems teaching the research practicum module. Few teachers reported difficulty at the other grade levels.

Table 18

Number and Percent of Success Teachers Planning To Use Program SY 1983-1984, By Grade

Grades	No Response		Yes, Will Use Program		No, Will Not Use Program		Total	Total
	#	%	#	%	#	%	%	#
1	3	25.0	9	75	0	0.0	100.0	12
2	0	0.0	10	100.0	0	0.0	100.0	10
3	0	0.0	16	100.0	0	0.0	100.0	16
4	0	0.0	9	100.0	0	0.0	100.0	9
5	0	0.0	2	50.0	2	50.0	100.0	4
6	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	100.0	100.0	1

One-hundred percent of the sample teachers of grades 2,3, and 4 will use the Success Program next year. Seventy-five percent of grade 1 teachers will use the program next year. In grade 5, two of the four teachers are willing to use the program next year. Table 19 displays advantages and disadvantages of the Success Program for grades 1-6.

Table 19

Advantages and Disadvantages of Success Program For Grades 1-6

Number of Teachers	Grade 1	Advantages
8	a.	Children are exposed to a variety of materials which helped to greatly increase vocabularies, language art skills and reading skills.
8	b.	Self concept development was promoted by the program.
4	c.	The program was meaningful and the child learned.
3	d.	Students at all levels were able to work at their own rate and do well.
2	e.	The program is very motivating.
2	f.	Lesson plans are provided for the teacher.
2	g.	Writing abilities have increased.

Table 19 (Cont.)

Number of Teachers	Grade 1	Disadvantages
6	a.	There was not enough time allocated for each module.
4	b.	With a large class it is difficult to individualize.
2	c.	Slow learners did not respond as well as hoped but there was some improvement.
2	d.	There was not enough material for the ACC module.
	e.	Teaching comprehension presented a problem.
	Grade 2	Advantages
7	a.	Program is exciting and motivating. The children and teacher feel successful.
4	b.	Children's reading and writing skills are greatly increased.
2	c.	Teachers can use their creativity.
2	d.	Lessons are planned for the teacher.
1	e.	Students scored high on tests given.
1	f.	Success covers all classroom levels with one plan.
		Disadvantages
4	a.	More time is needed to teach the modules.
2	b.	Large classes are more difficult to teach.
2	c.	There were not enough materials for class.
	d.	Principals lack knowledge of the program.
	e.	Drilling is still needed in phonics.
	f.	Skills are not listed in the same order as in SPP.
	g.	Weaker students lost interest.
	h.	It creates more work for the instructor.

Table 19 (Cont.)

Number of Teachers	Grade 3	
		Advantages
10	a.	The program enhances the students' ability to read a wide variety of material.
8	b.	It helps students to improve oral and written language.
5	c.	Skills carry over into other subject areas.
5	d.	Students work at their own pace.
2	e.	Teachers are able to get in extra areas of study such as art history, art appreciation, and music appreciation.
2	f.	It motivates the student.
2	g.	Creativity is enhanced.
	h.	The student is helped to become an organized worker.
	i.	Most skill areas are covered.
	j.	It is geared to the testing program.
	k.	It enhances the student's self-concept.
	l.	Lesson plans are written.
		Disadvantages
5	a.	Too many modules to cover for the school year and not enough time to properly cover each.
2	b.	Not all materials are available to teach the module.
2	c.	There was not enough space for charts. Folders were too bulky.
	d.	Some of the modules need more explanation or examples.

Table 19 (Cont.)

Number of Teachers	Grade 4	Advantages
6	a.	Reading and writing skills are greatly improved.
4	b.	The program motivates the children.
2	c.	Students learned to utilize many sources for information.
4	d.	It teaches life skills - reading newspaper, writing letters, checking, etc..
	e.	Children are able to experience some degree of achievement without being stigmatized by being identified with a specific reading level.
		Disadvantages
5	a.	Time was a problem.
	b.	There were not enough materials
	c.	Some of the skills had to be taught before the modules called for them.
	d.	Some of the Phonics/Spelling lesson could be combined in the upper grade rather than do one letter a day.

Number of Teachers	Grades 5&6	Advantages
3	a.	Reading and writing skills improved.
3	b.	Lesson themes have variety and flexibility.
	c.	Current events were taught daily.
	d.	Students became more independent learners.
	e.	It is a great vehicle for creative writing.
	f.	There is no grouping.
	g.	It motivates the students.
	h.	It assists in implementation of language arts objectives.

Table 19 (Cont.)

Number of Teachers	Grades 5&6	Disadvantages
2	a.	Not enough materials for lessons.
	b.	Time was a problem.
	c.	There was not enough emphasis on comprehension skills.
	d.	CBC guide and other materials were needed to be sure skills were mastered.

Summary: Grade 1-6 teachers appeared satisfied with the Success Program due to the following: (1) The Success Program had improved the reading performance of their students; (2) a high percentage of grades 1-5 teachers taught all Success modules each day; (3) teachers of grades 1,2,3,4 and 6 had no problem using SPP in conjunction with the Success Program; (4) grades 1-5 had a high percentage of Success teachers using the program exclusively; (5) one hundred percent of this sample of grades 2,3,4 and 6 will use the program next year; (6) many advantages of the program are cited by teachers of all grades.

There is the concern that there was variation in the number of lessons taught within each grade by each teacher by the end of May. This suggests that although a high percentage of the teachers reported using the Success Program exclusively, the number of lessons taught was not consistent across grades.

Junior High Teachers

Questionnaires were mailed to all junior high teachers in the Success Program in May 1983. Thirty-six questionnaires were mailed. Eleven questionnaires were returned for a 31% response rate. Information from these questionnaires was utilized as data.

Nine of the eleven teachers related that they considered the module and key elements (See Appendix A) especially written for junior high to be of junior high level.

Table 20 reports the type of junior high student helped most by the Success method.

Table 20

Type of Junior High Student Helped Most by the Success Method

Number of Teachers	
5	a. Those below grade level in grades 7,8 and 9.
3	b. The poor turned off male reader and the unmotivated, disinterested student; the newspaper lets him know that there is something interesting about reading after all.
	c. The student who wants to learn or is willing to learn (students don't have to be bright).
	d. The student who is already motivated and who is already reading on grade level.
	e. One who needs reinforcement in vocabulary development and comprehension skills.
	f. A student who is a reluctant reader and can be motivated by reading different types of articles on a variety of subjects.

Table 20 relates that students below grade level are seen as benefitting the most from the Success method at the junior high level.

Table 21 and 22 present junior high teachers' account of their utilization of the Success method.

Table 21

Number and Percent of Junior High Teachers Employing Success Method Weekly

	All Modules Taught On Weekly Schedule	No Response	All Modules Not Taught On Weekly Schedule	Total
Number	3	0	8	11
Percent	27.0	0.0	73.0	100

Seventy-three percent of the junior high teachers of this sample stated that they were not able to teach all modules weekly, as scheduled.

Table 22

Number and Percent of Junior High Teachers Employing All Success Key Elements Daily

	Yes, All Key Elements Employed Daily	No Response	No, All Key Elements Not Employed Daily	Total
Number	5	3	3	11
Percent	46.0	27.0	27.0	100

Forty-six percent of the junior high teachers were able to use all of the Success key elements required for a given instructional period.

Table 23 relates teachers' perception as to the degree the Success Program has improved the reading performance of their students.

Table 23

Junior High Teachers' Perception as to the Degree The Success Program Has Improved The Reading Performance of Their Students

Mean Rating*
5.0

* Means based on ratings by teachers on a 1-7 point scale with "1" meaning "little improvement" and "7" meaning "great improvement".

The junior high teachers of this sample mean rating of 5.0 indicated that these teachers perceived the Success program as moderately improving the reading performance of their students.

Ten of the eleven teachers of this sample reported that they will use the Success Program again next year.

Table 24 reports the advantages and disadvantages of the Success Program as seen by this sample of junior high teachers.

Table 24

Advantages and Disadvantages of the Success Program
As Reported by Success Junior High Teachers

Number of Teachers	Advantages
8	a. Develops students interests due to constant, current interesting news items.
5	b. Writing, vocabulary, spelling, etc. were improved.
3	c. They can discuss current events while learning to spell.
2	d. It is an indirect method of getting students to read and write.
2	e. Students have developed a more positive attitude toward reading.
2	f. The text on consumer information and functional reading skills offers excellent survival skills module for the program.
	g. Students were stimulated to read many library books.
	h. Students developed thinking and reading skills.
	i. Materials were readily available.
	j. Students were enthusiastic about using the newspaper.
	k. The planned lessons provided for consistency in teaching.
	l. It exposed students to political issues and general information that they needed to know to become a responsible citizen in the maintenance of society.

Table 24 (Cont.)

Number of Teachers	Disadvantages
6	a. There is not enough time scheduled or alloted by the Success manual to teach the modules.
3	b. This program would be more successful in a reading class rather than a subject area class.
3	c. More Newsweek Magazines were needed.
	d. Many times, papers were stolen.
	e. Group meetings are needed where we can get together and share.
	f. In some instances, there was a lack of interest on the part of the students.
	g. There were not enough newspapers for all students.
	h. Not enough background materials for current world affairs were provided.
	i. The focused reading and discussion part of each lesson done on a daily basis is seen by some older students as boring and being "busy" work.
	j. Writing assignments are vague and seem to repeat.
	k. The vocabulary development segment does not provide for teaching the child a specific skill.
	l. Program would be more efficient in a small class.
	m. This program should be used for a semester in junior high school.

Many advantages of the junior high Success program were stated. There were some disadvantages or concerns that stand out. Mainly, many teachers indicated that there were insufficient materials and lack of scheduled time to teach the modules.

Summary: Junior high teachers of this sample have reported some satisfaction with the program and several concerns. Satisfaction is shown by the following: (1) Success modules and key elements are considered of junior high level; (2) the program helped most students below grade level, unmotivated disinterested students in grades 7,8 and 9; (3) they report the program has moderately improved the reading performance of their students; (4) ten of the eleven teachers of this sample will use the Success Program again next year.

The following concerns are reported by the junior high teachers: (1) Seventy-three percent of the junior high teachers of this sample were not able to teach all modules as scheduled weekly; (2) Only forty-six percent of the teachers were able to use all of Success key elements required for a given class period; (3) Fifty-five percent of the sample reported that there is not enough time scheduled or allotted by the Success Manual to teach the modules; (4) Many teachers indicated there was insufficient material.

Results

Objective 5: To determine elementary principal satisfaction with the Success program by administering principal questionnaires at the end of school year 1982-1983.

Eighteen elementary principals out of a possible total of 45 returned questionnaires. This was a 40% response rate. Data for this objective has been obtained from these 18 questionnaires.

Principals of this sample have reported that there was improvement in teaching abilities of teachers using the Success program. Table 25 presents this information.

Table 25

Principals' Mean Ratings As To How The Success Program Improved Teaching Abilities

Mean Rating	*5.8

* Mean based on ratings by principals on a 1-7 point scale with "1" meaning "Less Improvement" and "7" meaning "Greater Improvement".

Table 26 relates the principals' mean rating for reading and writing attainment of Success children in comparison to children in other reading programs.

Table 26

Principals' Mean Rating For Reading And Writing Attainment Of Success Students In Comparison To Students In Other Reading Programs

Mean Rating	*5.5

* Mean based on ratings by principal on a 1-7 point scale with "1" meaning Less Improvement and "7" Greater Improvement.

The mean of 5.5 indicated that the principals saw the students as showing more improvement in reading than students in other reading programs.

Table 27 accounts the principals' assessments of the use of the Student Progress Plan (SPP) in conjunction with the Success Program.

Table 27

Principals' Assessment Of The Use Of The Student Progress Plan (SPP) In Conjunction With The Success Program

SPP And The Success Program	Number of Principals	Percent
No Problems Encountered	15	83
Problems Encountered	2	11
No Response	1	6
Total	18	100%

Ten of the total of 18 principals or 55% stated that other reading programs are being used in conjunction with their Success Programs. The following are the reasons reported by the principals for adding other reading programs:

(1) Skills required in SPP would not be covered at the appropriate time;

(2) Parents and principals wanted a textbook;

(3) Basal readers needed as the next teacher may not use the Success Program.

One of the ten principals related that Junior Great Books had also been added along with a basal reader to the Success Program. This was done to develop critical reading skills and oral discussion skills.

Tables 28 and 29 present the advantage and disadvantage of the Success Program as reported by the principals.

Table 28

A Summary Of Principals' Assessment Of Advantage of The Success Program

Number	Advantages
11	a. Students' self-concepts were enhanced and they are highly motivated by the Success Program.
10	b. It has helped to improve reading and writing skills.
7	c. The emphasis the program gives to writing is one of its most salient advantages.
6	d. A wide variety of material was used within the program.
4	e. Creative writing was started earlier and with greater success than with our regular programs.

Table 28 (Cont.)

A Summary of Principals' Assessment of Disadvantage of the Success Program

Number		Disadvantages
4	a.	Scheduling the Success Program is a problem due to other ongoing programs and activities.
3	b.	Not enough time was alloted for the teaching of the modules.
2	c.	Close supervision of teachers from the program director and reinforcement to use all modules is needed during the first semester of the year.
2	d.	Class size and chart space presents a problem.
1	e.	A newspaper is needed for each child.
1	f.	A highly skilled person is needed to implement the program effectively.
1	g.	The writing of three, four and five paragraph papers is too much for a whole class activity.

Sixteen of the 18 principals stated that they wanted the Success Program to continue at their schools.

Summary: Principals of this sample indicated satisfaction with the Success Program. Satisfaction is evidenced by the following: (1) Fifteen of the 18 principals reported that the teachers had no problem using SPP in conjunction with the Success Program; (2) principals of the sample are interested in using the program again next year; (3) they indicate that the reading and writing attainments of Success students in comparison to children in other reading programs were greater; (4) the Success Program has improved teaching abilities; (5) many advantages of the Success Program are listed. It must be noted that 10 of the eighteen principals or 55% are using other reading programs in conjunction with the Success Program.

Objective 6: To determine if the Success Program has had an impact on student promotions.

Promotion/retention data for the second semester of school year 1982-83 was analyzed for 1,336 Success students and 22,879 systemwide students, grades 1-4. This data is presented in Table 29.

The percentage of Success students promoted for grades 1-4 were 87,82,86 and 72 respectively. Systemwide percentage for students of grades 1-4 were 80,76,75 and 60 respectively. Success classes had a higher percentage of promotions.

The percentage of Success students assigned to transition classes due to reading deficiencies for grades 1-4 were 4,14,8 and 18 respectively. Systemwide percentages for students of grades 1-4 were 9,15,18 and 30 respectively. A larger percentage of system wide students than Success students were assigned to transition classes in grades 1,3 and 4.

The percentages of Success students retained in grades 1-4 were 9,4,6 and 10 respectively. Systemwide percentages for retention for grades 1-4 were 11, 9, 7 and 10 respectively. Success students had lower retention percentages in first, second and third grades than systemwide students.

Based on the above analysis it does appear that the Success Program has had a positive impact on promotions.

Summary: The Success Program has had a positive impact on student promotions as reflected in the following: (1) Success classes, grades 1 - 4, had a higher percentage of promotions than systemwide classes for grades 1 - 4; (2) a larger percentage of systemwide students for grades 1,3 and 4 were assigned to transition classes for reading deficiencies than Success students; (3) Success students had lower retention percentages in first and second grades than systemwide students.

Table 29

Promotion/Retention Data Second Semester SY 1982-1983
For Success And Systemwide Classes: Grades 1-4

Grade 1	Number Success	Percent Success	Number Systemwide	Percent Systemwide
Assigned Transition Classes (for Reading Deficiencies)	15	4	578	9
Retentions (Reading and Math Deficiencies)	37	9	700	11
Promoted (Without Reading Deficiencies)	356	87	5,279	80
Total	408	100%	6,557	100%
Grade 2				
Assigned Transition Classes (for Reading Deficiencies)	44	14	919	15
Retentions (Reading and Math Deficiencies)	14	4	527	9
Promoted (Without Reading Deficiencies)	284	82	4,690	76
Total	322	100%	6,136	100%
Grade 3				
Assigned Transition Classes (for Reading Deficiencies)	26	8	1,091	18
Retentions (Reading and Math Deficiencies)	20	6	418	7
Promoted (Without Reading Deficiencies)	294	86	4,693	75
Total	330	100%	6,202	100%

Table 29 (Cont.)

Promotion/Retention Data Second Semester SY 1982-1983
For Success And Systemwide Classes: Grades 1-4

Grade 4	Number Success	Percent Success	Number Systemwide	Percent Systemwide
Assigned Transition Classes (for Reading Deficiencies)	51	18	1,176	30
Retentions (Reading and Math Deficiencies)	27	10	403	10
Promoted (Without Reading Deficiencies)	198	72	2,405	60
Total	276	100%	3,984	100%

Recommendations

The analysis of data in the evaluation of the Success Program indicated the necessity for the following recommendations:

(1) Junior high teachers need more workshops and demonstrations in order to facilitate the instruction of their program;

(2) The class time periods for the teaching of the junior high modules need to be altered;

(3) Principals need to be urged not to schedule special subjects during the period the Success program is taught;

(4) The level of implementation of the Success program need to be continuously stressed to Success teachers; the program should be taught at least four days per week; all modules should be taught.

APPENDIX A

Pre - Kindergarten and Kindergarten Lessons

The following gives examples of a one-day program for grades Pre-K, K, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and junior high.

LESSON	PHASE I PICTURE/WORD ASSOCIATION	PHASE I ALPHABET FORMATION	PHASE I PUPPET PHRASES	PHASE I STORY TIME
1	persons	l	telephone talk	a name
2	animals	t	toys	a place
3	buildings	f	food	a verb
4	kitchens	h	playing	a name
5	landscapes	d	television	an adjective
6	furniture	i	safety	a time
7	feet.	j	pretty things	something that happened
8	story characters	k	school	a name
9	food	p	animals	something that caused something to happen

Grade I

Lesson I

Time	Module	Activity
9:15 - 9:45	Phonics/Spelling - r	Write on chart paper word clusters suggested by the student that contain r. Pronounce each word. Students write the letter r and words containing r. Discuss the meanings. Ex: raise your hand, a hard rock, fire truck siren. Student date and file papers. Display chart in classroom.
9:45 - 10:15	Language Experience-Environment: Houses	Write on board word clusters suggested by students concerning houses. Students cut a picture of a house and label its parts. Example of vocabulary: slanted roof, red brick chimney, patio door. Students begin a story about houses. Students data and file papers.
10:15 - 10:45	Academic, Cultural Arts, and Current Events Reading-Newspapers: L,l.	Students cut or tear the letters L, l, and words containing these letters from the newspaper. Paste. Check eah student for recognition of L,l. Students date and file papers.
10:45 - 11:00	Rest Period	
11:00 - 11:30	Patterning - ho.	Write on chart paper different endings for words beginning with ho. Ex.: hop, hockey, honk, hospital. Stress Emphasis: Vocal stress on one word near beginning of sentence. Display chart in classroom.
11:30 - 12:00	Recreational Reading - Library Books	Help individual students find and pronounce words in library books that contain p.

Source: Anne H. Adams, Success in Beginning Reading and Writing: The Basal Concept of the Future, (Santa Monica, Calif.: Goodyar Publishing Company, Inc., 1978), p. 6.

Grade 2

Lesson I

Time	Module	Activity
9:15 - 9:45	Phonics/Spelling	Letters to be studied, b, c. Students give expamples of: single, one-syllable words (Minimum of 10 with each letter)
9:45 - 10:15	Academic, Cultural Arts, Current Events Reading	Area: Science Global Reading Theme: Locating Information about animals. Material: Science textbooks, non-fiction books. Writing Assignment: List animals and information found about each.
10:15 - 10:45	Language Experience	Theme: Writing About Fun Segment Writing: Any topic. May be related to the theme. Writing Skill: List. Proofreading Thrust: Name and date on paper correctly.
10:45 - 11:00	Rest and Relaxation	
11:00 - 11:30	Recreational Reading	In individual teacher-student conferences, decode and discuss words containing "b".

Source: Anne H. Adams and Helen Cappleman, Success in Reading and Writing: Grade 2, (Santa Monica, California: Goodyear Publishing Company, Inc., 1978), p. 3.

Grade 3

Lesson I

Time	Module	Activity
9:15 - 9:45	Decoding in Context	Phase I: Lessons 1 - 40 Spelling Emphasis t Grammer Emphasis common nouns science
9:45 - 10:15	Research Practicum	Cycle I: Current Events Theme: People in the News Materials: Newspapers Reading Skills: Association of information Read about people and write names and titles.
10:15 - 10:45	Composition Fluency/Accuracy	Phase I (Lessons 1 - 90) Cycle I Theme: Classification of Like Items Sub-theme: Things seen on the way to school. Mode: Lists Proofreading Thrust: Spelling of some words on list.
10:45 - 11:00	Rest and Relaxation	
11:00 - 11:30	Recreational Reading	Skill Focus I Locating title of book

Source: Anne H. Adams and Helen Cappleman, Success in Reading and Writing: 3 (Santa Monica, California: Goodyear Publishing Company, Inc.) pp. 4-5.

Grade 4

Lesson I

Time	Module	Activity
9:15 - 9:45	Phonics/Spelling - bl	Phase I Introductory Phase: Lessons 1-10 Spelling Emphasis - Two Letter Consonant Clusters
9:45 - 10:15	Composition	Cycle One: Writing Descriptions and Comparisons People - Physically, Actions, etc. Materials: Newspapers Writing Assignment: Write sentences describing a classmate.
10:15 - 10:45	Study Skills	Cycle One: Alphabetizing Theme: People Material: Science Textbooks Reading Assignment: Read to find names of people Writing Assignment: Made a list of names and alphabetize the names.
10:45 - 11:00	Rest and Relaxation	
11:00 - 11:30	Recreational Reading	Cycle One: Teacher establishing model Everyone, including the teacher reads fiction or non-fiction books silently.

LESSON 50 PHONICS/SPELLING	COMPOSITION	STUDY SKILLS	RECREATIONAL READING
SPELLING EMPHASIS: ar 2-3 syllables in paragraphs VOCABULARY EMPHASIS: places MATERIAL: newspaper HOMEWORK: Using 5-10 words from chart, design a puzzle: crossword seek/find scrambled words	PRE-WRITING TOPIC: "My Magic Pencil" WRITING ASSIGNMENT: students write a creative story about a magic pencil. PROOFREADING THRUST: adjectives describing the pencil.	Cycle Six: Charts, graphs tables. KNOWLEDGE AREA: metric system READING/WRITING FOCUS: using a math book read to locate charts and/or graphs, tables using the metric system. List the metric terms. Teacher may wish to explain meaning of chart, graph, tables.	See Lesson 41

LESSON 51

	Cycle 11: Weather MATERIAL: Newspaper VOCABULARY: Precipitation SPELLING: -ur, -is MECHANICS: Combining noun phrases in subjects.	MATERIAL: History book, encyclopedia, and almanacs. STUDY SKILL: Locating cities with largest population in given area.	Cycle 6: COMPREHENSION: Characteristics, Location WORD ATTACK: Suffixes STUDY SKILL: Synonyms
PRE-WRITING: Volunteers recite advertising slogan. WRITING: Write a jingle or a salespitch to advertise a product.	See Lesson 1	READING: Read to determine which city in your area is largest. WRITING: Write a paragraph speculating about reasons for city's growth.	See Lesson 11

Junior High

Table 1 Weekly Schedule

MONDAY	TUESDAY	WEDNESDAY	THURSDAY	FRIDAY
Thirty Minutes	Twelve Minutes	Twelve Minutes	Twelve Minutes	Twelve Minutes
FUNCTIONAL READING: READING FOR SURVIVAL IN TODAY'S SOCIETY	CONSUMER VOCABULARY DEVELOPMENT	VOCABULARY DEVELOPMENT		
	Eight Minutes	Eight Minutes	Eight Minutes	Eight Minutes
	FOCUSED READING AND DISCUSSION			
	Fifteen Minutes	Fifteen Minutes	Fifteen Minutes	Fifteen Minutes
	READING AND WRITING RESEARCH			
Fifteen Minutes				
	Ten Minutes	Ten Minutes	Ten Minutes	Ten Minutes
READING FICTION AND NONFICTION BOOKS				

First Fifteen Minutes: CONSUMER VOCABULARY DEVELOPMENT.

Newspaper

Students locate words and/or abbreviations of words in an ADVERTISEMENT. Teacher writes on the chalkboard the words/abbreviations associated directly with FACTS AND OPINIONS, pronouncing each letter as it is written and pronouncing the words by syllables.

Students test each other on two words.

Next Ten Minutes: FOCUSED READING AND DISCUSSION.

Newspaper

Teacher directs a discussion of key elements in three different ADVERTISEMENTS. Write on the chalkboard a few key words associated with each advertisement.

Next Fifteen Minutes: READING AND WRITING RESEARCH:

Newspaper

Students write their interpretation of SALES TECHNIQUES USED IN ONE AD. The notebook page is dated. Thereafter, students read any parts of the newspaper of interest to them for the remainder of the 15 minutes.

Last Ten Minutes in the Lesson: READING FICTION AND NONFICTION BOOKS.

Books

Students' attention is directed solely to fiction and/or non-fiction books, whether reading, scanning, or looking at pictures. Nonfiction books can include textbooks. Teacher assists an many students as possible during this time frame in locating PREPOSITIONAL PHRASES in a book.

COMMENTS FROM PILOT TEACHER:

Do not reproduce without permission from Helen G. Cappleman.

APPENDIX B

Research Design for Success Program
School Year 1982-83

Objective	Method	Instrument	Population/Sample
1. To measure the effectiveness of the Success approach in improving the reading performance of students in the program.	Reading Scores of the Success sample will be compared with the reading scores of a comparison sample from the same school at the .05 level of performance. A posttest only design will be used. A second analysis will be done based on the level of implementation of the program.	Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills. Level of Implementation Checklist	Sample will be grade 3 Success and Comparison classes from Garrison, Gage-Eckington, West, Wilkinson, LaSalle, Cleveland, Congress Heights, Clark, Leckie, Takoma, Shepnerd and Powell.
2. To measure the effectiveness of the Success approach in improving the reading attitudes of the students.	There will be a comparison of Pretest and Posttest scores on the Estes Attitude Scale at the 0.5 level.	Estes Attitude Scale	Third and fourth grade Success students in the schools listed below: Congress Heights, Clark, Powell, Bunker Hill, Lewis, Gage Eckington, Meyer, Drew, Nalle, Slowe, Birney, Garrison, Leckie, Shepherd, Cleveland, Takoma, West, J.F. Cook, Harrison, LaSalle, Keene, Wilkinson.

Research Design for Success Program
School Year 1982-83
(continued)

Objective	Method	Instrument	Population/Sample
3. To measure the effectiveness of the Success approach in improving the writing performance of the students.	A creative writing assignment will be completed in April, 1983 by all Success students in grades 1-6. There will be a comparison group for each grade from the same school. Each writing assignment will be rated on a 4 point scale by two raters utilizing the holistic scoring method. Writing ratings of the Success sample will be compared with writing ratings of a comparison sample at the .05 level of significance.	Each student's creative writing paper.	Success and Comparison student from all Success elementary schools. The following are the schools of the Success population: Birney, Congress Hts., Garrison, Hendley, Wilkinson, Winston, Bowen, J.O. Wilson, Seaton, Moten, Leckie, Johnson, Garfield, M.C. Terrell, Friendship, Clark, Powell, Shepherd, Stoddert, Takoma, West, Whittier, H.D. Cooke, Marie Reed, Ketcham, Bryan, Brookland, Bunker Hill Cleveland, J.F. Cook, Harrison, Gage-Eckington, Lewis, Meyer, Slowe, Tubman, Keene, Wheatley, Plummer, Richardson, Drew, Nalle, LaSalle, Weatherless, Merritt

Research Design for Success Program
School Year 1982-83
(continued)

Objective	Method	Instrument	Population/Sample
4. To determine teacher satisfaction with the Success program by administering teacher questionnaires at the end of school year 1982-83.	Descriptive statistics (frequencies, percentages and means where appropriated) will be used to analyze data.	Elementary Teacher Questionnaire, Pre-Kindergarten and Kindergarten Teacher Questionnaire, Junior High School Teacher Questionnaire.	All teachers in the Success program except special teachers.
5. To determine principal satisfaction with the Success program by administering principal questionnaires at the end of school year 1982-83.	Descriptive statistics (frequencies, percentages and means where appropriated) will be used to analyze data.	Principal Questionnaire	All Elementary Principals in the Success program. (See population under #3.)

Research Design for Success Program
School Year 1982-83
(continued)

Objective	Method	Instrument	Population/Sample
6. To determine if the Success program has had an impact on student promotion.	The Success groups promotion/retention rate will be compared to the system's promotion/retention rate by grade.	Division of Automated Information Services - Promotion/Retention Report for the Success program and for the D.C. Public School System.	Grades 1-6 using the program full-time in the following schools: Birney, Congress Hts., Garrison, Hendley, Wilkinson, Bowen, Moten, Leckie, Clark, Powell, Shepherd, Stoddert, Takoma, West, Whittier, H.D. Cooke, Marie Reed, Bryan, Bunker-Hill Cleveland, J.F. Cook, Harrison, Gage-Eckington, Lewis, Meyer, Slowe, Tubman, Keene, Wheatley, Drew, Nalle, LaSalle, Weatherless

APPENDIX C

Name _____ Grade _____

Directions: Indicate your feelings about reading by writing the letters A, B, C, D, or E in the blank to the left of each statement.

A = strongly agree /B = agree /C = undecided
D = disagree /E = strongly disagree

PART I

____ 1. Reading is for learning but not for enjoyment.

____ 2. Money spent on books is well-spent.

____ 3. There is nothing to be gained from reading books.

____ 4. Books are a bore.

____ 5. Reading is a good way to spend spare time.

____ 6. Sharing books in class is a waste of time.

____ 7. Reading turns me on.

____ 8. Reading is only for grade grubbers.

____ 9. Books aren't usually good enough to finish.

___ 10. Reading is rewarding to me.

___ 11. Reading becomes boring after about an hour.

___ 12. Most books are too long and dull.

___ 13. Free reading doesn't teach anything.

____14. There should be more time for free reading during the school day.

___ 15. There are many books which I hope to read.

___ 16. Books should not be read except for class requirements.

___ 17. Reading is something I can do without.

___ 18. A certain amount of summer vacation should be set aside for reading.

___ 19. Books make good presents.

___ 20. Reading is dull.

APPENDIX D

HOLISTIC SCORING

Holistic scoring (Spandel and Stiggin, 1980) is based on raters reviewing a paper for an overall or "whole" impression. Although specific factors (grammar, vocabulary, etc.) may influence the rater's response, these considerations are never directly addressed. Consistency--both among raters and among scores assigned by a single rater--is very important in holistic scoring (Spandel and Stiggins, p. 20).

The papers will be rated on a four-point scale. Before the scoring process begins, "...the trainer and the most qualified or experienced raters will review a subtest of the papers to be scored in order to identify range finders." (ibid). Range finders are representative of all the papers at a given scoring level. Range finders are gotten for each score, respectively, that is, for 4, 3, 2, and 1. Papers used as range finders at given levels should be so typical of papers at that level that all raters agree to the assigned score. Range finders are used as models to assist raters during scoring.

In holistic scoring there is not any predetermined set of criteria to identify range finders. For example, "A paper assigned a score of 4 will simply be a relatively high quality paper within a given group; it may or may not be an excellent paper in its own right." (ibid).

It has been found that the holistic approach will produce marked consistency among raters.

Two raters should read all papers to minimize the chance of error resulting from rater fatigue, prejudice, or other extraneous factors.

In order to determine a final score, scores may be added or averaged across raters. If there is disagreement of more than one rating point, it can be resolved through discussions by the disagreeing raters.

Experienced raters can go through 30 to 40 papers per hour. To insure high reliability, scoring should be restricted to six hours per day. Best results are gotten with short hours and frequent breaks.

Source: Spandel, Vicki and Stiggins, Richard J. Direct Measures of Writing Skill. Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory: Clearinghouse for Applied Performance Testing. Portland Oregon.

APPENDIX E

District of Columbia Public Schools
Success In Reading and Writing Program

Prekindergarten and Kindergarten Teacher
Questionnaire

Since you have been a participant in the Success In Reading and Writing Program your reactions are an important part of the assessment of the overall program. Please complete the following questionnaire items as indicated.

(1) Please rate the level of enjoyment experienced by you and your students with the following modules by placing in X on the appropriate number.

Picture Word Association Module

Teacher

Very Unenjoyable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Highly Enjoyable

Student

Very Unenjoyable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Highly Enjoyable

Alphabet Module

Teacher

Very Unenjoyable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Highly Enjoyable

Student

Very Unenjoyable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Highly Enjoyable

Oral Language/Reading Module

Teacher

Very Unenjoyable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Highly Enjoyable

Student

Very Unenjoyable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Highly Enjoyable

Story Time Module

Teacher

Very Unenjoyable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Highly Enjoyable

Student

Very Unenjoyable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Highly Enjoyable

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(2) Please rate the extent the Success Program has improved the listening and speaking abilities of pre-kindergarten and kindergarten students.

Little Improvement 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Great Improvement

(3) Students participating in the Success Program are quite proud of their academic accomplishments.

Yes No

(4) Have you found that your prekindergarten and kindergarten children are learning to associate words with tangible items and intangible concepts in pictures more rapidly with the Success program than with a traditional program?

Yes No

(5) Have you found that your prekindergarten/kindergarten children can read words printed in a variety of materials?

Yes No

(6) Please indicate below, if applicable, any module that you have found particularly difficult to teach. State briefly the reason for the difficulty.

_____

_____

_____

_____

(7) Did you use the Success method exclusively for your pre-kindergarten or kindegarten classes?

Yes No

If the answer is no, please, indicate below why you are not using the Success method exclusively.

_____

_____

_____

(8) Do you plan to use the Success program again next year?

Yes No

(9) Please list below advantages and disadvantages of using the Success program.

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX F

District of Columbia Public Schools
Success In Reading and Writing Program

Elementary Teacher Questionnaire

Since you have been a participant in the Success In Reading and Writing program your reactions are an important part of the assessment of the overall program. Please complete the following questionnaire items as indicated.

Please check the box indicating what grade you teach.

First ☐ Second ☐ Third ☐

Fourth ☐ Fifth ☐ Sixth ☐

1. Please indicate by placing an X on the appropriate number the degree you feel the Success program has improved the reading performance of your students.

Little Improvement 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Great Improvement

2. Please indicate below, if applicable, the modules you have found most difficult to teach. State, briefly, the reason for the difficulty.

_____

_____

_____

_____

3. Do you use the Success program five days per week? Please check the appropriate box.

Yes ☐ No ☐

4. If the answer to Number 3 is no, please, indicate in the blank below how many days per week you used the Success program.

_____

5. If you did not use the Success program 5 days per week please state below why you didn't.

_____

_____

_____

_____

6. Are all Success modules taught by you when you use the Success program? Please check the appropriate box.

Yes ☐ No ☐

7. If the answer to Number 6 is no, please state below which modules you usually teach._____

_____

_____

_____

8. Please also state on the blanks below, if applicable, why you teach only the modules you indicated in Number 7. _____

_____

_____

_____

9. Have you had any problems incorporating the Success program with the Student Progress Plan objectives?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If the answer above is yes, please, indicate why incorporating Student Progress Plan objectives with the Success program is a problem.

_____

_____

_____

_____

10. Please indicate in the blank below the number of the last Success lesson taught by you. _____

11. Did you use the Success program exclusively in your reading/language arts program?

Yes ___ No ___

12. Please list advantages and disadvantages of the Success program. (Use back of the sheet if necessary.)

Advantages: _____

_____

_____

_____

Disadvantages: _____

_____

_____

_____

13. Are you planning to use the Success In Reading and Writing program next year?

Yes ___ No ___

APPENDIX G

District of Columbia Public Schools
Success In Reading and Writing Program

Junior High School Teacher Questionnaire

Since you have been a participant in the Success In Reading and Writing program your reactions are an important part of the assessment of the overall program. Please complete the following questionnaire items as indicated.

1. Please indicate by placing an X on the appropriate number the degree you feel the Success program has improved the reading performance of your students.

Little Improvement	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Great Improvement

2. What type of junior high school student is helped most by the utilization of the Success method?

_____

_____

_____

3. Have you been able to teach all modules as indicated in the weekly schedule?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If the answer is no. please, indicate why you have not been able to teach all modules as scheduled during the week.

_____

_____

_____

4. Are you able to use all of the key elements required for a given day?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If the response was no, please indicate why this answer was given .

_____

_____

_____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

5. Do you consider the modules and key elements to be of Junior High level?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If the response is no, please indicate a reason.

_____

_____

_____

6. Which modules do you usually teach on a weekly basis?

_____

_____

_____

7. Please list advantages and disadvantages of the Success program.

Advantages: _____

_____

_____

Disadvantages: _____

_____

_____

8. Do you plan to use the Success program next year?

Yes ☐ No ☐

APPENDIX H

District of Columbia Public Schools
Success In Reading and Writing Program

Principal-Questionnare

The purpose of this questionnaire is to find out your reactions to the Success In Reading and Writing program.

(1) Do you feel that children in the Success programs have shown more improvement, at this point, in reading and writing abilities than children in other reading programs being taught at your elementary school?

Less Improvement 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Greater Improvement

(2) In general, do you feel the Success program has helped to improve teaching abilities of participating teachers within your school?

Less Improvement 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Greater Improvement

(3) Are the teachers of your schools using other reading programs along with the Success program?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If the answer is yes, please indicate below the reading programs being utilized.

_____

_____

_____

Please indicate below also the reason(s) why it was felt other reading programs were needed.

_____

_____

_____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(4) Have you encountered any problems utilizing the Success in Reading and Writing program in conjunction with the Student Progress Plan?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If your response is yes, please indicate the problem(s) encountered below.

Problems

_____

_____

_____

_____

(5) Are you interested in the Success program continuing at your school?

Yes ☐ No ☐

(6) List below advantages or disadvantages you see with the Success program.

Advantages: _____

_____

_____

Disadvantages: _____

_____

_____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX I

Percentile to Normal Curve Equivalent Conversion Table

NCE	Percentile	NCE	Percentile	NCE	Percentile	NCE	Percentile
1	1.0	26	36.5	51	50.5	76	64.9
2	6.7	27	37.1	52	51.1	77	65.6
3	10.4	28	37.7	53	51.6	78	66.3
4	13.1	29	38.3	54	52.1	79	67.0
5	15.4	30	39.0	55	52.6	80	67.7
6	17.3	31	39.6	56	53.2	81	68.5
7	18.9	32	40.1	57	53.7	82	69.3
8	20.4	33	40.7	58	54.2	83	70.1
9	21.8	34	41.3	59	54.8	84	70.9
10	23.0	35	41.9	60	55.3	85	71.8
11	24.2	36	42.5	61	55.9	86	72.8
12	25.3	37	43.0	62	56.4	87	73.7
13	26.3	38	43.6	63	57.0	88	74.7
14	27.2	39	44.1	64	57.5	89	75.8
15	28.2	40	44.7	65	58.1	90	77.0
16	29.1	41	45.2	66	58.7	91	78.2
17	29.9	42	45.8	67	59.3	92	79.6
18	30.7	43	46.3	68	59.9	93	81.1
19	31.5	44	46.8	69	60.4	94	82.7
20	32.3	45	47.4	70	61.0	95	84.6
21	33.0	46	47.9	71	61.7	96	86.9
22	33.7	47	48.4	72	62.3	97	89.6
23	34.4	48	48.9	73	62.9	98	93.3
24	35.1	49	49.5	74	63.5	99	99.0
25	35.8	50	50.0	75	64.2		